



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,662	01/12/2001	Walter J. Fant	1-3-3	2700
75	90 10/14/2004		EXAM	IINER
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR			BANANKHAH, MAJID A	
AVAYA INC. 307 MIDDLETOWN-LINCROFT ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROOM 1N-391			2127	
LINCROFT, N	J 07738		DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SC

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/759,662	WALTER J. FANT ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
_	Majid A Banankhah	2127				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.12 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period volume to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ja	anuary 2001.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application	* v					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	^					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	nty documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/31/01, 8/11/04.</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
S. Potent and Trademark Office						

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application filed on January 12 2001, and the preliminary Amendment filed on August 11, 2004. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

## Claim Objections

2. Claims 17-18 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The claim is improper because the claim does not comply with the infringement test. The claim is not a proper dependent claim because the apparatus that perform one of the methods can do other methods. It is not a proper dependent claim because it does not include all the limitations of the claim in which it depends from. See also MPEP 608.01 (n).

Claim 18 is objected to because it depends on an improper independent claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 12 is recites the limitation "the multimedia signal" in line 5, and "said signal processing operation" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/759,662

Art Unit: 2127

Claim 12 in line 4-5 recites: "adapting the contents of said signal-processing resource set depending on the multimedia signal to be processed". It is unclear what this statement means.

The relationship between "adapting the content" and the "multimedia signal to be processed" is unclear.

In line 9-10, the step reciting: "a resource interface wherein operations are defined that make it possible to control said signal-processing resources: is vague. The relationship between the "interface" and the "operation" is unclear.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisler et al. (US Pat. No. 6,078,942, hereinafter Eisler).

While claim 12, is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as stated above (Section 3, *supra*), in order to advance prosecution, claims will be treated on the merits in view of examiner's best understanding of the disclosure and the prior art.

Per claims 12, the reference of Eisler teaches of

Per claim 12, a multimedia platform for defining multimedia functions each capable of

monitoring the operation of a set of multimedia platform signal-processing resources, putting

Application/Control Number: 09/759,662

Art Unit: 2127

them in contact (col. 3, lns. 34-45), adapting the contents of said signal-processing resource set depending on the multimedia signal to be processed, and using said multimedia functions to apply said signal-processing operations to said multimedia signals, and including a plurality of signal-processing resources, comprising (col. 3, lns. 46-54):

a resource interface wherein operations are defined that make it possible to control said signal-processing resources (col. 3, lns. 3-12, and col. 5, ln. 47 to col. 6, ln. 7);

a resource management unit for allocating signal-processing resources depending on the signal-processing operation to be carried out and managing exchanges among signal-processing resources (col. 6, lns. 45-62);

an application interface wherein said multimedia functions are defined (col. 5, lns. 47-60); and

an application unit having an application program for applying said multimedia functions (col. 4, lns 27-36, and col. 5, ln. 64 to col. 6, ln. 7).

While the reference of Eisler teaches of allocating signal processing resource (Fig. 4) he fails to explicitly teach of "dynamic allocation". However, it is well known in the art that in a multitasking environment access to the media device when it has the focus and changing focus while the application has access to the media device (col. 6, lns. 45-55) is dynamic and therefore, the management of the resource is performed dynamically, for the reason that static allocation is inefficient and for that reason in a multitasking environment the resources are allocated dynamically. It is obvious for a person ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use dynamic allocation of resource because it is more efficient and efficient and saves time.

Application/Control Number: 09/759,662

Art Unit: 2127

5. Claims 1-11, and 13-16 are allowed.

#### Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Majid A. Banankhah** whose telephone number is (571) **272-3770**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thursday, 8:00 AM 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Maid Banankhah

9/27/04

PRIMARY EXAMINER